

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 15 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Lim** (US 7,053,880); and claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lim** in view of **Sato** (US 7,030,848).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that **Lim** does not teach or suggest:

adjusting, ***independently for each color***, an intensity of light incident on said display element and a light control variable in said display element, based on the respective grayscale level of each color

as recited in claim 14 and “an adjusting unit” for performing this function as recited in claim 1.

Lim discloses that “when the image signal for a [full] screen is inputted, an average luminance value R_a , G_a and B_a of each of components R, G and B is calculated in ST1 (step 1)”; that “[e]ach of average luminance values R_a , G_a and B_a will be selected when it is bigger than the gray level 128”; and that “[t]he light source which is to be turned on at the fourth sub-frame is decided in ST2 (step 2).” (Col. 8, lines 52-57.) Thus, **Lim** discloses that color components greater than a level of 128 in average luminance values R_a , G_a and B_a are added to data at the fourth sub-frame basically for white light.

Claims 1 and 14 of the present invention recite adjusting, independently for each color, an intensity of light incident on the display element and a light control variable in said display

Application No. 10/743,806
Attorney Docket No. 032148
Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

element, based on the respective grayscale level of each color detected in the detecting unit. Lim does not disclose performing color adjustment for R, G and B at respective sub-frames as in the present claims. The display device as recited in the present claims can reduce power consumption thereof using a simpler framing scheme than in Lim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 14 are patentable over the cited references, and claims 3-12 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-12 and 14 is hereby solicited.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Andrew G. Melick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,868
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp